R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 734 AC 002 261

WASHINGTON STATE ANNUAL PROGRAM PLAN AMENDMENT, FISCAL YEAR 1968, TITLE 1, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965. SECTION 10.

WASHINGTON STATE DEPT. OF COMMERCE AND ECON. DEV.

PUB DATE 28 JUN 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.64 14P.

DESCRIPTORS- *STATE PROGRAMS, *COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS, *UNIVERSITIES, *PROGRAM PROPOSALS, RURAL AREAS, URBAN AREAS, BUDGETS, FINANCIAL SUPPORT, STATISTICAL DATA, HUMAN RESOURCES, PUBLIC OFFICIALS, WASHINGTON STATE, TITLE 1 (89-329),

SECTION 10 OF THE WASHINGTON STATE PROGRAM PLAN AMENDMENT, FISCAL YEAR 1968, TO THE STATE PLAN FOR TITLE 1 OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 CONSISTS OF A SUBMITTAL STATEMENT TOUCHING ON PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND COORDINATION AND ON THE SELECTION OF PERTINENT COMMUNITY PROBLEMS, A PROGRAM STATEMENT (INCLUDING A LIST OF SPECIFIC PROGRAMS) STRESSING SEVERAL RURAL AND URBAN PROBLEM AREAS, AND DETAILD EXPLANATIONS OF THE PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM AND ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGETS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968. (LY)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED018734

Dept. of Commerce & Economic Development
Community Service Programs
June 28, 1967

Washington State Annual Program Plan Amendment, Fiscal Year 1968

Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965

Section 10. Annual Program Plan Amendment

10.1 Submittal Statement

This Annual Program Plan is an amendment to the State of Washington State Plan for Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as approved by the United States Office of Education on June 22, 1966, and is submitted in compliance with Section 173.4 and 173.12 of the federal regulations pertaining to Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965.

1. In addition to the Community Service Advisory Council, the state agency has consulted with representative community leaders, associations, and organizations, and with representatives of institutions of higher education, including:

School of Social Work, University of Washington,
Assistant Dean Fred Lewin

United Good Neighbors, Planning Division,
Seattle, King County
Roger Thibeaudeau, Director

Office of Economic Opportunity, State Office
Byron Brady, Director

Mineo Katagiri, Community leader, Seattle

State Planning Staff

Department of Urban Planning, University of
Washington

David Rowlands, City Manager of Tacoma

Publications on state and local problems have also been consulted, including:

HUD Publication, Priority Needs for Training in Scarce Urban Skills

U.S. Dept. Health, Education and Welfare, Division of Research, Low Income Life Styles, Lola M. Irelaw, ed.

Intergovernmental Relations in the Poverty Program

State Legislative Program

Washington State Department of Commerce & Economic Development, Planning Goals for Washington, A Preliminary Staff Report, State Planning Series, No. 6, November, 1966

Municipal Government in the State of Washington

2. Due consideration has been given to the existence of other federally financed programs dealing with similar and other community problems in the state and coordination with those programs, particularly in determining priorities of problems. The plan has been checked against directories of federal and local programs to determine that:

(a) No other agency or program applies specifically to problems of local government from a neutral and objective standpoint at present. Yet the problems of local government response to rapid urbanization to a declining economy are basic to meeting many other community problems.

(b) Although many agencies have programs directed at specific aspects of broad problems such as poverty, for example, much remains to be done in adult education which is not covered by any present program.

3. Due consideration has been given to the resources of institutions of higher education especially relevant or adaptable to develop and carry out community problems selected.

Contacts have been made with departments or schools within the universities to encourage development of proposals in those fields. For example, the Departments of Political Science at Washington State University and the University of Washington, were contacted, among others.

4. Due consideration has been given to the relationship of the aspect of the community problem(s) selected for solution to other significant community problems in the state.

The problems selected have been selected on the basis of a high priority of need, and an adaptability to solution by the techniques provided under Title I legislation. Many other pressing problems exist in the State, but require extensive basic research before solutions can be found. Other needs are funded under other federal and state programs. While we are under no illusion that the list of problems in this amendment is in any sense an exhaustive list, it represents an optimized meeting of solvable problems with available competencies, within the limits of the Title I budget.

5. Other criteria have been used in selecting community service problems to be included under the program.

Among the other criteria considered in developing this program are several having to do with the general philosophy of Title I programming for the state. These include

(1) consideration of geographic spread of Title I programs to serve communities with pressing problems.

(2) the existence of a number of depressed areas with special needs in the non-metropolitan regions of the state.

(3) concentration of programs at universities and colleges of proven quality in respect to Title I compared with attempting to extend the program base to additional colleges in more communities.

(4) a balance of subject matter attractive to universities with varying capacities and specialties.

(Concentration on a single "umbrella" subject automatically eliminates opportunities for participation by some universities).

(5) a focus on the role of the institution of higher education as the resource by which the community can be assisted to become aware of the dimensions of its problems, and to find its own solutions to these problems, as compared to providing ready-made solutions for the community to act upon.

10.2 Program Statement

Washington State's 1968 annual amendment for Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965, has been developed from the concept that a need or problem can only be defined in terms of an objective or goal. A staff study prepared by the state planning agency, "Goals for Washington", was taken as the basis for identifying the problem areas. These general goals for state development also apply to communities, since they are concerned specifically with the individuals comprising both the State and its communities. The goals are:

1. A healthful, efficient and attractive environment for all State residents.
2. An adequate economic level for all State residents, in terms of
    a. Job opportunities for individuals
    b. Developing the industrial base of the community
3. Provision of State and local public services and facilities of adequate standard and equal availability to all State residents and all areas of the State.

In developing the Title I program, we have considered that a list of the obstacles which prevent meeting these State goals would be, in itself, a list of identified problem areas. Within such an inventory, a choice has been made of problems especially adaptable

to solution through Title I programs. Thus, each of the problem areas and the specific problems listed relates to an existing obstacle to attainment of goals for the people of the State, and to the Title I program's role in attempting to assist in solving community problems. The list is by no means exhaustive but represents a feasible program within the limitations of budget and available competencies.

Based on the general goals listed above, two specific objectives were identified for the 1968 Title I program. These are:

a. a continuing effort and emphasis on the problems of local government, and a new target area,

b. human resources problems.

In developing this annual amendment the Department has consulted with other agencies and individuals listed in another part of this amendment. Title I monies are to be allocated approximately 1/2 to problems of government and 1/2 to human resources problems.

A. Problems of Local and Regional Government

Of continuing concern in the Washington Title I program are the problems of local and regional government, and the present inadequate ability of many governmental units to adapt to the changing needs of rapidly urbanizing and urbanized areas. For example, industrial expansion, particularly in aircraft industries, has faced several previously unorganized rural or suburban communities with the need to provide a complete organization and a full range of urban services virtually overnight.

Other communities simply have far too many, too small, too expensive and too limited special governmental units, none able to operate or cooperate effectively. Here the need is for regional approaches to problems of governmental services which have expanded behond the means of local governmental units to provide. University resources can provide a neutral forum as well as essential back-up information for local agencies working to

develop regional approaches to their needs. The university can also provide a design for regionally oriented activities.

In spite of rapid growth in some parts of the state, other urban areas are faced with seriously declining economies and with the immediate need for the community to determine how it can best respond to economic problems. The universities can encourage and assist action by local leaders toward an evaluation of their position, and where appropriate, toward the relations of local government and economic development.

Continuing efforts to provide a public understanding of the need and value of developing new adaptive techniques for government are needed. In some cases, the number of local governmental units is not the problem as much as their capacity to respond to changing needs. Special districts with specifically limited powers, of which Washington has more than 30 types, provide a case in point.

Limitations on ability to meet change are also a hindrance to the operation of general government. Public understanding of the problem of governmental response to change is essential before more efficient governmental services are possible.

The need to maintain the quality of the urban environment in terms of air and water quality controls is a governmental problem of increasing concern. Specific educational measures for enhanced public understanding of the public's stake in air and water quality are needed.

The role of private consultants to governmental agencies and the extent of their influence on the direction of governmental decision-making is an important but unmeasured force in the governmental process. Actions taken by local units of government based on consultants' recommendations may be seriously limited in their long range value to the community.

Finally, the problems of relating expanding state planning activities to local, metropolitan and regional planning are very much before us with the recent passage of legislation providing

for a new agency, the Planning and Community Affairs Agency in the office of the Governor. Programs to acquaint local and regional planning agencies, commission and elected officials with the goals of state planning and the ties between local and state planning efforts will be vital to efficient working relationships.

A list of programs aimed at solving the governmental problems described above includes the following:

1. To assist local units of government and their constituents in developing regional units or councils of governments.
2. To hold in-service or continuing education training sessions for local government personnel, elected or operational, to learn and apply new management techniques, to better understand their role in local or regional government or otherwise provide education for a high quality of public service.
3. To bring the role of the private consultant into focus for governmental decision-making personnel.
4. To offer educational programs aimed at facilitating public action toward the environmental controls necessary to maintain health and retain desirable levels of the economy.
5. To develop public understanding of long range conservation problems in a state still heavily oriented toward natural resources as a major part of its economic base.
6. To offer demonstration programs on methods of encouraging economic growth.
7. To assist communities to use urban design as a vital input into the total planning process.
8. To develop and apply community value measurements

to be used as a decision base in planning for urban facilities, for example, sewers vs. park development, or a bridge vs. public housing.

9. To develop working relationships between local regional and state planning activities.

B. Problems of Human Resources

For the 1968 fiscal year, the scope of the Washington State Title I program has expanded to include recreation, housing, youth opportunities, employment, health and poverty, set in the context of human resources. The 1968 program is intended to be fairly broad and exploratory; a narrowing of focus is anticipated in subsequent annual amendments, following a detailed administrative study which will be carried on during the 1968 fiscal year.

Two general groups of problems in the area of human resources and need are:

-- problems of urban-suburban area residents

-- problems of rural area residents

Urban Areas

Briefly, examples of problems of particular concern in the major urban areas of the state include:

1. Employment

   a. To develop pilot training programs for persons who will work with the aged and to assist the community in activating such programs.

   b. To develop programs to train and use paraprofessional workers in health and social service capacities.

   c. To develop techniques for retraining or continued education of women desiring to return to the labor force, and developing services designed to facilitate their return.

2. Housing

   a. To present information on housing quality, availability and housing needs of the poor, for community use.

3. Health

   a. To develop a pilot program for community health service, for the poor.

Rural Areas

In the agricultural areas of Washington State, we face problems such as the drain of young people due to lack of opportunities for youth, and a lack of acceptable quality of governmental services, in rural areas. There is a basic need for widespread citizen understanding of the problems of the rural poor, and for aid to the community in designing and setting up programs to meet their specific health, employment, educational and community needs. Programs designed to meet community-relations, recreational, employment and service needs of local Indian Tribes and of migrant workers and their families are also vitally important.

Although limited, specialized types of assistance to the rural poor are available under other federal programs, many rural communities have no way to analyze their needs, still less to meet them. Communities in these areas need aid in identifying, analyzing, understanding and solving the special problems of the rural poor. Specific problem areas identified for this annual amendment are:

1. To assist the community to recognize and act on community relations problems, including recreation, representation in community decisions, etc. of locally resident Indians and migrant workers, and their families.

2. Youth Opportunity

   To assist the community to expand and enhance youth opportunities in agricultural areas and

their market centers.

3. Governmental Services

   To assist the community to develop adequate services in rural areas in terms of housing, utilities, and health services, and in terms of developing year-round employment and training or retraining.

4. Poverty

   To identify and develop community leadership among the poor in rural areas. To develop pilot projects for community planning of existing social welfare services in outlying urban centers and non-metropolitan areas of the state.

Notices of Activation of CSCE programs will be forwarded to the Office of Education, Division of Adult Education Programs on or before December 15, 1967.

Rural Areas

In the agricultural areas of Washington State, there is a continuous draining off of young people due to lack of opportunities for jobs, or for adequate social and recreational contacts, and there is difficulty in providing educational and other services on a par with those of urban areas. In addition, social services based in rural areas frequently do not reach certain portions of their potential clientele, although frequently it is the unreached group that is most in need of these services.

It is recognized that fewer and fewer people are needed to support agricultural production, and that a certain amount of population loss is bound to occur. However, those who leave should be provided with the skills needed to compete in urban areas and to adapt to urban life; those who remain should have complementary or equivalent services and amenities available.

Specific problem areas identified for this annual amendment are:

1. The need for an educational, informational program on a pilot basis intended to reach those permanent residents in rural areas who are potential clients for social services, but who are unaware of such programs or reluctant to approach those agencies which might assist them.

2. The need for an experimental public education program aimed at developing public understanding of the community needs of migrant and Indian groups living in or near the community.

3. The need for a pilot program aimed at educating community leadership to study the opportunities for youth in their area, and to devise means of improving job and recreational opportunities for young people.

Washington State
Department of Commerce & Economic Development
Community Service Programs
June 28, 1967

10.31 Explanation of 1968 Fiscal Year Program Budget

a. General Comments

Alternative budgets for either 75-25 per cent matching or 50-50 per cent matching are listed in two columns. For the items starred, it must be emphasized that the amounts listed for the 50-50 matching ratio are maximum possible expenditures. They are not necessarily realistic in terms of expected spending. A 50-50 ratio will eliminate some schools and/or some potential programs of merit. Total expenditures for the Title I program may well run considerably less with a 50-50 matching ratio than with a 75-25 ratio, and it is possible that difficulty may be encountered in expending the entire State allotment. Figures have been rounded for convenience.

b. Specific Comments on Program Budget

Line 1. Differences in amounts listed for administrative spending are explained in Section 10.41.

Line 2, 3. The figures in the 75-25 column are determined by

(1) deducting the federal share of administrative costs from the total state allotment

(2) dividing the remainder into equal parts and adding the State matching share of 25%.

In the 50-50 column the procedure was similar, using the 50% State share.

Washington State
Department of Commerce & Economic Development
Community Service Programs
June 28, 1967

10.3 1968 FISCAL YEAR PROGRAM BUDGET FOR TITLE I HEA

Line	Item	Alternative Budgets Matching Ratios of 75-25	or 50-50
1.	Administrative Costs (see itemized administrative budget Section 10.4)	$ 33,332	$ 25,000
2.	Governmental Programs (total federal and state expenditures)	98,400	160,099*
3.	Human Resources Programs (total federal and state expenditures)	98,400	160,099*
4.	Total	$230,132	$345,198

STATE-FEDERAL MATCHING SHARES

1.	State Agency Share			$ 8,333	$ 12,500
2.	Institutions Share			49,200	160,099*
3.	Federal Matching of	75%	or 50%		
4.	a) Administrative costs	$ 24,999	$ 12,500		
5.	b) Programs	147,600	160,099		
				172,599	172,599
6.	Total Title I expenditures			$230,132	$345,198*

*See Section 10.31(a)

Washington State
Department of Commerce & Economic Development
Community Service Programs
June 28, 1967

10.4 1968 FISCAL YEAR ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET FOR TITLE I HEA

Line	Item	Alternative Budgets Federal Matching Ratios of 75-25	50-50
	Personnel		
1	Administrator	$12,000	$ 8,000*
2	Clerical	5,000	5,000
3	Accounting and other services	1,000	500
4	Consultants (review and annual plan)	2,300	300
5	Employee benefits	1,400	1,300
6	Supplies, materials, printing and reproduction, etc.	500	150
7	Equipment	300	100
	Expenditures for		
8	Staff travel	750	650
9	Advisory Council travel	750	250
10	Consultant travel	700	250
11	Administrative Study Contract	8,500	8,500
	Totals	$33,200	$25,000
	Department share	$ 8,300	$12,500
	Title I share	$24,900	$12,500

*See Section 10.41

Washington State
Department of Commerce & Economic Development
Community Service Programs
June 28, 1967

10.41 Explanation of 1968 Administration Budget

Line 1. Under a 50-50 matching ratio, the administrator will spend 2/3 time rather than full time on administrative matters in connection with Title I.

Line 5. Employee Benefits would be correspondingly decreased.

Line 6. Under a 75-25 matching ratio, reports and a newsletter or other public relations materials would be prepared for distribution statewide to institutions, local government officials, selected community organizations, state agencies, and others. This would not be possible with a 50-50 ratio.

Lines 8, 9 and 10.

Both columns include travel for Title I staff, the Community Services Advisory Council (travel to and from Council meetings), and consultant travel. Total travel expenditures would be $2200 with a 75-25 ratio, but travel would be severely limited, to only $1150 with a 50-50 matching ratio.

Line 11. The administrative study contract, phase 2, will be the same with either ratio, since the agency is committed to its performance.